

## **Remarks**

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed May 12, 2008.

### **I. Summary of Examiner's Objections and/or Rejections**

Prior to the Office Action mailed May 12, 2008, Claims 1-3, 8, 9, 11, 12, 18-22, 29-32 and 40-55 were pending in the Application.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-3, 8-9, 11-12, 18 and 40-47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-3, 8-9, 11-12, 18-22, 29, 32, 40-44 and 48-55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shen et al. (US 2004/0221322 A1) hereinafter Shen, in view of Tomita et al (US 2003/0090495 A1) hereinafter Tomita, further in view of Plow et al. (US 6,429,883 B1) hereinafter Plow, Smith (US 5,933,141) hereinafter Smith, and Frank et al. (US 5,651,1078) hereinafter Frank. Claims 30-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shen, Tomita, Plow, Smith and Frank as applied to claim 29, and further in view of Takata et al. (EP 0990998 A2) hereinafter Takata. Claims 45-47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shen, Tomita, Plow, Smith and Frank as applied to Claim 40, and further in view of Takata and Doner et al. (US 5,598,557) hereinafter Doner.

### **II. Summary of Applicants' Amendments**

The present Reply cancels Claim 46; amends Claims 1-3, 8-9, 11-12, 18-19, 22, 29, 32, 40, 42-45, 47-50, and 52-55; and adds Claim 56, all as shown above. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to prosecute any originally presented or canceled claims in a continuing or future application.

### **III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101.**

In the Office Action, Claims 1-3, 8-9, 11-12, 18 and 40-47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Those claims have been amended to overcome this rejection. Accordingly, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

### **IV. Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1-3, 8-9, 11-12, 18-22, 29, 32, 40-44 and 48-55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §

103(a) as being unpatentable over Shen, in view of Tomita, further in view of Plow, Smith, and Frank. Claims 30-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shen, Tomita, Plow, Smith, Frank, and further in view of Takata. Claims 45-47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shen, Tomita, Plow, Smith, Frank, and further in view of Takata and Doner.

#### **Claim 1**

Claim 1, as amended, sets forth the following:

1. A system to support multimedia content browsing on a mobile device, comprising:  
a browsing component software application executed by a processor in the mobile device, wherein the mobile device comprises a display screen;  
wherein the browsing component renders a keyword query text box in a first area of the display screen, multimedia contents in a second area of the display screen, and a video controller in a third area of the display screen;  
wherein the multimedia contents are rendered on overlapping content layers within the second area of the display screen, the content layers comprising a first content layer that renders query results, a second content layer that renders keyframes, and a third content layer that renders videos, wherein the content layers always overlap each other in totality throughout the entire area of the second area of the display screen;  
wherein the browsing component further renders a transparent widget layer on the display screen, the transparent widget layer being completely transparent within the display screen until activated by a user, wherein the transparent widget layer independently, interactively and continuously adjusts the degree of transparency of two or more of the content layers via an input device, wherein transparency values for the content layers comprise continuous gradient values between 0.0 and 1.0, a content layer having a transparency value of 0.0 being completely transparent and a content layer having a transparency value of 1.0 being completely opaque; and  
wherein the browsing component receives the multimedia contents from a processing component based on a keyword query, wherein the processing component searches for and retrieves the multimedia contents relevant to the keyword query from a multimedia content database, wherein the processing component transmits the multimedia contents relevant to the keyword query to the browsing component over a communication network.

Applicants' invention embodied in Claim 1 is not obvious in light of Shen, Tomita, Plow, Smith and Frank, among other things, for the following reasons. Of the five references cited in the Office Action, none of the cited references include a browsing component software application executed by a processor in a mobile device having a display screen that renders a keyword query text box in a first area of the display screen, multimedia contents in a second area of the display screen and a video controller in a third area of the display screen. Moreover, none of the cited references disclose rendering multiple content layers in a specific area of the display screen, wherein the content layers comprise a first content layer for rendering query

results, a second content layer for rendering keyframes, and a third content layer for rendering videos.

Accordingly, Applicants' system embodied in Claim 1 is not anticipated by, or obvious in light of the combination of Shen, Tomita, Plow, Smith and Frank and reconsideration is respectfully considered.

#### **Claim 45**

Claim 45, as amended, includes a video controller that includes a graphical representation of each video segment, a relevance bar and a text box that displays the keywords associated with the video segments. It is respectfully submitted that Doner does not disclose the use of a video controller, much less a video controller comprising a graphical representation of each video segment, a relevance bar and a text box that displays the keywords associated with the video segments. Accordingly, Applicants' system embodied in Claim 45 is not anticipated by, or obvious in light of the cited references and reconsideration is respectfully considered.

#### **Claim 56**

Claim 56 has been added to the application. It is respectfully submitted that Claim 56 is not obvious in light of the cited references. Specifically, Claim 56 includes the limitation that the display screen comprises a touch screen. It is noted that Tomita teaches using a device having an inclination sensor that detects the inclination of the body of the device as opposed to using a touch screen wherein the browsing component receives user input through gestures made on the touch screen. Thus, Tomita teaches away from this limitation and should not be combined with the other references to reject this claim. Similarly, the inventions disclosed in Plow, Smith and Frank also do not appear to use a touch screen. Accordingly, Applicants' system embodied in Claim 56 is not anticipated by, or obvious in light of the cited references and reconsideration is respectfully considered.

#### **Claims 19 and 29**

Independent Claims 19 and 29 are not addressed separately but it is respectfully submitted that those claims are allowable for the same reasons that Claim 1 is allowable as commented on above. Accordingly, Applicants' representative respectfully submits that Claims

19 and 29 are neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

**Claims 2-3, 8-9, 11-12, 18, 20-22, 30-32, 40-44 and 47-55**

Dependent Claims 2-3, 8-9, 11-12, 18, 20-22, 30-32, 40-44 and 47-55 are not addressed separately but it is respectfully submitted that those claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicants' representative respectfully submits that these Claims are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. It is also submitted that these claims add their own limitations that render them patentable in their own right. Applicants' representative respectfully reserves the rights to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

**V. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this reply, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Oct. 20, 2008

By: /Rex Hwang/  
Rex Hwang  
Reg. No. 56206

Customer No. 23910  
FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
650 California Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800